

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

CASE:

DOUG LONGHINI,

Plaintiff,

v.

HAMMOCKS TOWN CENTER LLC, EL  
TRUINFO GROUP INC., d/b/a EL GRAN  
BAMBOO RESTAURANT, and MIWI,  
CUBAN & AMERICAN SANDWICH  
SHOP CORP., d/b/a MIWI CAFÉ,

Defendants.

---

**COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff, DOUG LONGHINI, individually and on behalf of all other similarly situated mobility-impaired individuals (hereinafter “Plaintiff”), sues Defendants, HAMMOCKS TOWN CENTER LLC, EL TRUINFO GROUP INC., d/b/a EL GRAN BAMBOO RESTAURANT, and MIWI, CUBAN & AMERICAN SANDWICH SHOP CORP., d/b/a MIWI CAFÉ, (hereinafter “Defendants”), and as grounds alleges:

**JURISDICTION, PARTIES. AND VENUE**

1. This is an action for injunctive relief, a declaration of rights, attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, and costs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181, et seq., (the “Americans with Disabilities Act” or “ADA”) and 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

2. The Court has original jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s claims arising under 42 U.S.C. § 12181, et seq. pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343 and 42 U.S.C. § 12117(a).

3. The Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, and may render declaratory judgment on the existence or nonexistence of any right under 42

U.S.C. § 12181, et seq.

4. Plaintiff, DOUG LONGHINI, is an individual over eighteen years of age, with a residence in Miami-Dade County, Florida, and is otherwise sui juris.

5. At all times material, Defendant, HAMMOCKS TOWN CENTER LLC, was and is a Florida Limited Liability Company, with its principal place of business in Jacksonville, Florida.

6. At all times material, Defendant, HAMMOCKS TOWN CENTER LLC, owned and operated a commercial shopping center at 10201 Hammocks Boulevard, Miami, Florida 363196 (hereinafter the "Commercial Property") and conducted a substantial amount of business in that place of public accommodation in Miami, Florida.

7. At all times material, Defendant, EL TRUINFO GROUP INC., d/b/a EL GRAN BAMBOO RESTAURANT, was and is a Florida Profit Corporation, with its principal place of business in Miami, Florida.

8. At all times material, Defendant, EL TRUINFO GROUP INC., owned and operated a commercial restaurant at 10325 Hammocks Boulevard, Miami, Florida 33196 (hereinafter the "Commercial Property") and conducted a substantial amount of business in that place of public accommodation in Miami, Florida. Defendant, EL TRUINFO GROUP INC, holds itself out to the public as "EL GRAN BAMBOO RESTAURANT."

9. At all times material, Defendant, MIWI, CUBAN & AMERICAN SANDWICH SHOP CORP., d/b/a MIWI CAFÉ, was and is a Florida Profit Corporation, with its principal place of business in Miami, Florida.

10. At all times material, Defendant, MIWI, CUBAN & AMERICAN SANDWICH SHOP CORP., d/b/a MIWI CAFÉ, owned and operated a commercial restaurant at 10201

Hammocks Boulevard #105, Miami, Florida 33196 (hereinafter the "Commercial Property") and conducted a substantial amount of business in that place of public accommodation in Miami, Florida. Defendant, MIWI, CUBAN & AMERICAN SANDWICH SHOP CORP., holds itself out to the public as "MIWI CAFÉ."

11. Venue is properly located in the Southern District of Florida because Defendants' Commercial Property and restaurant business is located in Miami-Dade County, Florida, Defendants regularly conduct business within Miami-Dade County, Florida, and because a substantial part(s) of the events or omissions giving rise to these claims occurred in Miami-Dade County, Florida.

#### FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

12. Although over thirty (30) years have passed since the effective date of Title III of the ADA, Defendants have yet to make its facilities accessible to individuals with disabilities.

13. Congress provided commercial businesses one and a half years to implement the Act. The effective date was January 26, 1992. In spite of this abundant lead-time and the extensive publicity the ADA has received since 1990, Defendants continue to discriminate against people who are disabled in ways that block them from access and use of Defendants' business and property.

14. The ADA prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in 28 CFR 36.201 and requires landlords and tenants to be liable for compliance.

15. Plaintiff, DOUG LONGHINI, is an individual with disabilities as defined by and pursuant to the ADA. Plaintiff uses a wheelchair to ambulate. Plaintiff, DOUG LONGHINI, has very limited use of his hands and cannot operate any mechanisms which require tight grasping or twisting of the wrist. He also has a great deal of trouble walking or otherwise ambulating without

the use of a wheelchair. He is limited in his major life activities by such, including but not limited to walking, standing, grabbing, grasping and/or pinching.

16. Mr. Longhini is a staunch advocate of the ADA. Since becoming aware of his rights, and their repeated infringement, he has dedicated his life to this cause so that he, and others like him, may have full and equal enjoyment of public accommodations without the fear of discrimination and repeated exposure to architectural barriers in violation of the ADA.

17. He is often frustrated and disheartened by the repetitiveness of the complaints he is forced to make to employees and management at different places of public accommodation over thirty (30) years after the legislation of the ADA, to no avail. Mr. Longhini is accordingly of the belief that the only way to affect change is through the mechanisms provided under the ADA.

18. Defendant, HAMMOCKS TOWN CENTER LLC, owns, operates and/or oversees the Commercial Property, its general parking lot/or and parking spots specific to the business therein, exterior and interior paths of travel. Defendants, HAMMOCKS TOWN CENTER LLC, EL TRUINFO GROUP INC., d/b/a EL GRAN BAMBOO RESTAURANT, and MIWI, CUBAN & AMERICAN SANDWICH SHOP CORP., d/b/a MIWI CAFÉ, own, operate and/or oversee the Commercial Property, and interior of the restaurant, to include the restrooms and the property and places of public accommodation is located in Miami, Florida.

19. The subject Commercial Property is open to the public and is located in Kendall, Miami-Dade County, Florida. The individual Plaintiff visits the Commercial Property, to include visits to the Commercial Property on or about August 18, 2023, September 3, 2023, and September 4, 2023, and encountered multiple violations of the ADA that directly affected his ability to use and enjoy the Commercial Property. He often visits the Commercial Property in order to avail himself of the goods and services offered there because it is approximately five (5) miles from his

residence and is near other businesses and restaurants he frequents as a patron. He plans to return to the Commercial Property within two (2) months of the filing of this Complaint in order to avail himself of the goods and services offered at the places of public accommodation and check if it has been remediated of the ADA violations he encountered.

20. The Plaintiff found the Commercial Property to be rife with ADA violations. The Plaintiff encountered architectural barriers at the Commercial Property and wishes to continue his patronage and use of each of the premises.

21. The Plaintiff has encountered architectural barriers that are in violation of the ADA at the subject Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property. The barriers to access at the Commercial Property have each denied or diminished Plaintiff's ability to visit the Commercial Property and have endangered his safety in violation of the ADA. The barriers to access, which are set forth below, have likewise posed a risk of injury(ies), embarrassment, and discomfort to Plaintiff, DOUG LONGHINI, and others similarly situated.

22. Defendants HAMMOCKS TOWN CENTER LLC, EL TRUINFO GROUP INC., d/b/a EL GRAN BAMBOO RESTAURANT, and MIWI, CUBAN & AMERICAN SANDWICH SHOP CORP., d/b/a MIWI CAFÉ, own and/or operate places of public accommodation as defined by the ADA and the regulations implementing the ADA, 28 CFR 36.201 (a) and 36.104. Defendants, HAMMOCKS TOWN CENTER LLC, EL TRUINFO GROUP INC., d/b/a EL GRAN BAMBOO RESTAURANT, and MIWI, CUBAN & AMERICAN SANDWICH SHOP CORP., d/b/a MIWI CAFÉ are responsible for complying with the obligations of the ADA. The places of public accommodation that Defendants, HAMMOCKS TOWN CENTER LLC, EL TRUINFO GROUP INC., d/b/a EL GRAN BAMBOO RESTAURANT, and MIWI, CUBAN & AMERICAN SANDWICH SHOP CORP., d/b/a MIWI CAFÉ, own and/or operate is the

Commercial Property and Business located at 10201 Hammocks Boulevard, Miami, Florida 33196.

23. Plaintiff, DOUG LONGHINI, has a realistic, credible, existing and continuing threat of discrimination from the Defendants' non-compliance with the ADA with respect to the described Commercial Property, including but not necessarily limited to the allegations in this Complaint. Plaintiff has reasonable grounds to believe that he will continue to be subjected to discrimination at the Commercial Property, in violation of the ADA. Plaintiff desires to visit the Commercial Property, not only to avail himself of the goods and services available at the Commercial Property, but to assure himself that the Commercial Property is in compliance with the ADA, so that he and others similarly situated will have full and equal enjoyment of the Commercial Property without fear of discrimination.

24. Defendant, HAMMOCKS TOWN CENTER LLC, as landlord and owner of the Commercial Property, is responsible for all ADA violations listed in Counts I through III. Defendant, EL TRUINFO GROUP INC., d/b/a EL GRAN BAMBOO RESTAURANT, as tenant and owner and/ operator of a business within the Commercial Property, is jointly and severally responsible and liable for all ADA violations listed in this Count II of this Complaint. Defendant, and MIWI, CUBAN & AMERICAN SANDWICH SHOP CORP., d/b/a MIWI CAFÉ, as tenant and owner and/ operator of a business within the Commercial Property, is jointly and severally responsible and liable for all ADA violations listed in this Count III of this Complaint.

25. Defendants have discriminated against the individual Plaintiff by denying him access to, and full and equal enjoyment of, the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of the Commercial Property, as prohibited by 42 U.S.C. § 12182 et seq.

**COUNT I – ADA VIOLATIONS AS TO DEFENDANT, HAMMOCKS TOWN CENTER  
LLC**

26. The Plaintiff adopts and re-alleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 25 above as though fully set forth herein.

27. Defendant, HAMMOCKS TOWN CENTER LLC, has discriminated, and continues to discriminate, against Plaintiff in violation of the ADA by failing, inter alia, to have accessible facilities by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). A list of the violations that Plaintiff encountered during his visit to the Commercial Property, include but are not limited to, the following:

A. Main Parcel - Parking

- i. The Plaintiff had difficulty accessing the facility, as there are designated accessible parking spaces located too far from an accessible route to the facility. Violation: Some of the accessible parking spaces are not located on the shortest route to an accessible entrance, violating Section 4.6.2 of the ADAAG and Section 208.3.1 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ii. The Plaintiff had difficulty exiting the vehicle, as designated accessible parking spaces are located on an excessive slope. Violation: There are accessible parking spaces located on an excessive slope violating Section 4.6.3 of the ADAAG and Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iii. The Plaintiff had difficulty exiting the vehicle, as designated accessible parking space access aisles are located on an excessive slope. Violation: There are accessible parking space access aisles located on an excessive slope violating Section 4.6.3 of the ADAAG and Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

- iv. The Plaintiff had difficulty exiting the vehicle, as an access aisle of the required width is not provided. Violation: There are accessible parking spaces that do not have compliant access aisles provided, violating Sections 4.1.2(5a) and 4.6.3 of the ADAAG and Section 502.3.1 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- v. There are accessible parking spaces that do not provide signs designating them as accessible, violating Section 4.6.4 of the ADAAG and Section 502.6 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

**B. Entrance Access and Path of Travel**

- i. The Plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel, as it is not continuous and accessible. Violation: There are inaccessible routes from the public sidewalk and transportation stop. These are violations of the requirements in Sections 4.3.2(1), 4.3.8, 4.5.1, and 4.5.2 of the ADAAG and Sections 206.2.1, 302.1, 303, and 402.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ii. The Plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel due to abrupt changes in level. Violation: There are changes in levels of greater than ½ inch, violating Sections 4.3.8 and 4.5.2 of the ADAAG and Section 303 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iii. The Plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel, as it was not continuous and accessible. Violation: There are inaccessible routes between sections of the facility. These are violations of the requirements in Sections 4.3.2(2), 4.3, and 4.5 of the ADAAG and Sections 206.2.2, 303, 402 and 403, whose resolution is readily achievable.



- iv. The Plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel, as there are cross slopes in excess of 2%. Violation: The path of travel contains excessive cross slopes in violation of Section 4.3.7 of the ADAAG and Section 403.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- v. The Plaintiff had difficulty using some of the curb ramps, as the slopes are excessive. Violation: There are curb ramps at the facility that contain excessive slopes, violating Section 4.7.2 of the ADAAG and Sections 405.2 and 406.1 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- vi. The Plaintiff could not traverse through areas of the facility, as the required 36” path is not provided. Violation: A continuous path of travel connecting all essential elements of the facility is not provided, violating Sections 4.2.1, 4.3.2(2), & 4.3.3 of the ADAAG and Sections 206.2.2 & 403.5.1 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

C. Kendall Ice Arena – Parking:

- i. The Plaintiff had difficulty exiting the vehicle, as designated accessible parking spaces are located on an excessive slope. Violation: There are accessible parking spaces located on an excessive slope violating Section 4.6.3 of the ADAAG and Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ii. The Plaintiff had difficulty exiting the vehicle, as designated accessible parking space access aisles are located on an excessive slope. Violation: There are accessible parking space access aisles located on an excessive slope violating Section 4.6.3 of the ADAAG and Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

D. Kendall Ice Arena – Entrance Access and Path of Travel

- i. The Plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel, as it is not continuous and accessible. Violation: There are inaccessible routes from the public sidewalk and transportation stop. These are violations of the requirements in Sections 4.3.2(1), 4.3.8, 4.5.1, and 4.5.2 of the ADAAG and Sections 206.2.1, 302.1, 303, and 402.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ii. The Plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel due to abrupt changes in level. Violation: There are changes in levels of greater than ½ inch, violating Sections 4.3.8 and 4.5.2 of the ADAAG and Section 303 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iii. The Plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel, as it was not continuous and accessible. Violation: There are inaccessible routes between sections of the facility. These are violations of the requirements in Sections 4.3.2(2), 4.3, and 4.5 of the ADAAG and Sections 206.2.2, 303, 402 and 403, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iv. The Plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel, as there are cross slopes in excess of 2%. Violation: The path of travel contains excessive cross slopes in violation of Section 4.3.7 of the ADAAG and Section 403.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- v. The Plaintiff could not traverse through areas of the facility, as the required 36” path is not provided. Violation: A continuous path of travel connecting all essential elements of the facility is not provided, violating Sections 4.2.1, 4.3.2(2), & 4.3.3 of the ADAAG and Sections 206.2.2 & 403.5.1 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose

resolution is readily achievable.

- vi. The Plaintiff had difficulty using some of the curb ramps, as the slopes are excessive. Violation: There are curb ramps at the facility that contain excessive slopes, violating Section 4.7.2 of the ADAAG and Sections 405.2 and 406.1 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

**COUNT II – ADA VIOLATIONS AS TO DEFENDANTS, HAMMOCKS TOWN CENTER LLC, and EL TRUINFO GROUP INC., d/b/a EL GRAN BAMBOO RESTAURANT.**

28. The Plaintiff adopts and re-alleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 25 above as though fully set forth herein.

29. Defendants, HAMMOCKS TOWN CENTER LLC, and EL TRUINFO GROUP INC., d/b/a EL GRAN BAMBOO RESTAURANT, have discriminated, and continue to discriminate, against Plaintiff in violation of the ADA by failing, *inter alia*, to have accessible facilities by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). A list of the violations that Plaintiff encountered during his visit to the Commercial Property, include but are not limited to, the following:

A. El Gran Bamboo Restaurant – Access to Goods and Services

- i. The Plaintiff could not utilize the bar counter, as it is mounted too high. Violation: There are bar counters that are not at the prescribed height, violating Section 4.32.4 and 5.2 of the ADAAG and Section 902.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ii. There is seating provided at the facility that does not comply with the standards prescribed in Section 4.32 of the ADAAG and Sections 226 & 902 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

B. El Gran Bamboo Restaurant – Public Restrooms

- i. The Plaintiff had difficulty using the locking mechanism on the toilet compartment door without assistance, as it requires tight grasping. Violation: The toilet compartment door has non-compliant hardware for disabled patrons, violating Sections 4.13.9, 4.17.5, & 4.27.4 of the ADAAG and Sections 309.4, & 604.8.1.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ii. The Plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as a trashcan obstructs the clear floor space. Violation: The required clear floor space is not provided next to the toilet, violating Section 4.16.2 and Figure 28 of the ADAAG, 28 CFR 36.211, and Section 604.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iii. The Plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as the rear grab bar is not mounted at the required height. Violation: The grab bars in the accessible toilet compartment do not comply with the requirements prescribed in Sections 4.17.6 of the ADAAG and Section 609.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iv. The Plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance in the accessible toilet compartment, as objects are mounted less than 1 1/2” below a grab bar, obstructing its use. Violation: The grab bars do not comply with the requirements prescribed in Sections 4.17.6 and 4.26 of the ADAAG and Section 609.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- v. The Plaintiff could not exit the restroom without assistance, as the required maneuvering clearance was not provided due to the location of a trashcan.

Violation: The restroom door does not provide the required latch side clearance due to a lack of maintenance violating Section 4.13.6 of the ADAAG, 28 CFR 36.211, and Section 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

**COUNT III – ADA VIOLATIONS AS TO DEFENDANTS, HAMMOCKS TOWN CENTER LLC, and MIWI, CUBAN & AMERICAN SANDWICH SHOP CORP., d/b/a MIWI CAFÉ.**

30. The Plaintiff adopts and re-alleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 25 above as though fully set forth herein.

31. Defendants, HAMMOCKS TOWN CENTER LLC, and MIWI, CUBAN & AMERICAN SANDWICH SHOP CORP., d/b/a MIWI CAFÉ, have discriminated, and continue to discriminate, against Plaintiff in violation of the ADA by failing, inter alia, to have accessible facilities by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). A list of the violations that Plaintiff encountered during his visit to the Commercial Property, include but are not limited to, the following:

A. Miwi Cafe – Access to Goods and Services

- i. The Plaintiff could not use the sales counters without assistance, as they are mounted too high. Violation: There are sales counters at the facility in excess of 36” high, violating Section 7.2(1) of the ADAAG and Section 904.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

B. Miwi Cafe – Public Restrooms

- i. The restroom signage is not mounted at the required location, violating Section 4.30.6 of the ADAAG and Section 703.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

- ii. The Plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as the grab bars are not the required length. Violation: The grab bars do not comply with the requirements prescribed in Section 4.16.4 & Figure 29 of the ADAAG and Sections 604.5 & 609.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iii. The Plaintiff had difficulty using the toilet without assistance, as it is not mounted at the required distance from the side wall. Violation: The water closet is mounted at a non-compliant distance from the side wall, violating Section 4.16.2 and Figure 28 of the ADAAG and Section 604.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iv. The Plaintiff could not use the lavatory without assistance, as it is mounted too high. Violation: There are lavatories in public restrooms with the counter surface mounted too high, violating the requirements in Section 4.19.2 and Figure 31 of the ADAAG and Section 606.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

### **RELIEF SOUGHT AND THE BASIS**

32. The discriminatory violations described in the Complaint are not an exclusive list of the Defendants' ADA violations. Plaintiff requests an inspection of the Defendants' places of public accommodation in order to photograph and measure all of the discriminatory acts violating the ADA and barriers to access in conjunction with Rule 34 and timely notice. Plaintiff further requests to inspect any and all barriers to access that were concealed by virtue of the barriers' presence, which prevented Plaintiff, DOUG LONGHINI, from further ingress, use, and equal enjoyment of the Commercial Business; Plaintiff requests to be physically present at such inspection in conjunction with Rule 34 and timely notice. Plaintiff requests the inspection in order

to participate in crafting a remediation plan to address Plaintiff's request for injunctive relief. The remediations for the ADA violations listed herein are readily achievable.

33. The individual Plaintiff, and all other individuals similarly situated, have been denied access to, and have been denied full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, benefits, programs, and activities offered by Defendants, Defendants' building, businesses and facilities; and has otherwise been discriminated against and damaged by the Defendants because of the Defendants' ADA violations as set forth above. The individual Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, will continue to suffer such discrimination, injury and damage without the immediate relief provided by the ADA as requested herein. In order to remedy this discriminatory situation, the Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Defendants' places of public accommodation in order to determine all of the areas of non-compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Plaintiff requests the inspection in order to participate in crafting a remediation plan to address Plaintiff's request for injunctive relief.

34. Defendants have discriminated against the individual Plaintiff by denying him access to full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of its places of public accommodation or commercial facility, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12181 et seq. and 28 CFR 36.302 et seq. Furthermore, Defendants continue to discriminate against Plaintiff, and all those similarly situated, by failing to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; and by failing to take such efforts that may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services.

35. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law, will suffer irreparable harm, and has a clear legal right to the relief sought. Further, injunctive relief will serve the public interest and all those similarly situated to Plaintiff. Plaintiff has retained the undersigned counsel and is entitled to recover attorneys' fees, costs and litigation expenses from Defendants pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205 and 28 CFR 36.505.

36. Defendants are required to remove the existing architectural barriers to the physically disabled when such removal is readily achievable for their places of public accommodation. The Plaintiff and all others similarly situated, will continue to suffer such discrimination, injury and damage without the immediate relief provided by the ADA as requested herein. In order to remedy this discriminatory situation, the Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Defendants' places of public accommodation in order to determine all of the areas of non-compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

37. Notice to Defendants is not required as a result of the Defendants' failure to cure the violations by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if any Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). All other conditions precedent have been met by Plaintiff or waived by each Defendant.

38. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188, this Court is provided with authority to grant Plaintiff Injunctive Relief, including an order to alter the property where Defendants operate their businesses, located at and/or within the commercial property located at 10201 Hammocks Boulevard, Miami, Florida 363196, the exterior areas, and the common exterior areas of the Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial Property, to make those facilities readily accessible and useable to the Plaintiff and all other mobility-impaired persons; or by closing the facility until such time as the Defendants cure the violations of the ADA.



WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff, DOUG LONGHINI, respectfully requests that this Honorable Court issue (i) a Declaratory Judgment determining Defendants at the commencement of the subject lawsuit were and are in violation of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 et seq.; (ii) Injunctive relief against Defendants including an order to make all readily achievable alterations to the facilities; or to make such facilities readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA; and to require Defendants to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; and by failing to take such steps that may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services; (iii) An award of attorneys' fees, costs and litigation expenses pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; and (iv) such other relief as the Court deems just and proper, and/or is allowable under Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Dated: October 25, 2023

**GARCIA-MENOCAL & PEREZ, P.L.**

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

350 Sevilla Avenue, Suite 200

Coral Gables, Florida 33134

Telephone: (305) 553-3464

Facsimile: (855) 205-6904

Primary E-Mail: ajperez@lawgmp.com

Secondary E-Mails: bvirues@lawgmp.com;

jacosta@lawgmp.com

By: /s/ Anthony J. Perez

ANTHONY J. PEREZ

Florida Bar No.: 535451

BEVERLY VIRUES

Florida Bar No.: 123713